A Divided Hungary in Europe: Exchanges, Networks and Representations, 1541-1699

Edited by

Gábor Almási, Szymon Brzeziński, Ildikó Horn, Kees Teszelszky and Áron Zarnóczki

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS PUBLISHING

Volume 3

The Making and Uses of the Image of Hungary and Transylvania

Edited by

Kees Teszelszky

A Divided Hungary in Europe:
Exchanges, Networks and Representations, 1541-1699;
Volume 3 – The Making and Uses of the Image of Hungary and Transylvania,
Edited by Kees Teszelszky

This book first published 2014

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-6688-1, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-6688-0

Contents

FORMS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE IMAGE OF HUNGARY IN POLAND-LITHUANIA

SZYMON BRZEZIŃSKI

Polish–Hungarian relations are a well-established area of research, and their history in the early modern period has mostly been viewed through the perspective of historical, social, economic and cultural similarities. This point of view, which is generally justified, has also influenced the study of the image of Hungarians in Polish public opinion. One reason for this is the role of a widely known stereotype of "eternal" friendship and brotherhood, which—while based on earlier tradition—became commonplace no sooner than in the late eighteenth century. The aim of this study is to give an overview of the image of Hungarians and Hungary in Poland-Lithuania from the mid-sixteenth century to the second half of the seventeenth century, i.e. to the end of Ottoman rule in Hungary. It will sum up the results of scattered and internationally lesser-known scholarship, but also complete it with new factors and sources, which have not been taken into consideration in this context.

Two general approaches can be observed in the scholarship on the image of Hungarians in early modern Polish opinion. The first one is a study of political and cultural discourses and the history of *topoi*, so far chiefly based on literary texts and to some extent on popular political writings. Among the main authors are the literary historians Lajos Hopp and Jan Ślaski with their studies of Polish–Hungarian cultural relations, their main *topos* as "bulwark" *(antemurale)* nations and the "similarity"/"alliance" of both countries throughout history *(conformitas)*.[1] Janusz Tazbir and Stanisław

[1] L. Hopp, *Az "antemurale" és "conformitas" humanista eszméje a magyar-lengyel hagyományban* [The humanist idea of "antemurale" and "conformitas" in the Hungarian–Polish tradition] (Budapest 1992); L. Hopp and J. Ślaski, *A magyar–lengyel múltszemlélet előzményei. Politikai és kulturális hagyományok Báthory Istvánig* [Antecedents of the Hungarian–Polish view of the past. Political and cultural traditions until the age of Stephen Báthory] (Budapest 1992); cf. L. Hopp, "Les principes de l' 'antemurale' et la 'conformitas' dans le tradition hungaro-polonaise avant Báthori," *Acta Litteraria Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 31,

Grzybowski, who used political literature and journalism more extensively,[2] investigated the issues from a somewhat different perspective. The second approach concentrated on studying national stereotypes in the context of the shaping of Polish identity and only marginally involved the problem of stereotypes of Hungarians. Beginning with the pre-war studies of Jan Stanisław Bystroń, this trend was continued by Janusz Tazbir and other authors, who developed a model of "the rise of Polish xenophobia" in seventeenth to eighteenth century, contrasted with the more tolerant sixteenth century.[3] Another notion of the Polish research on stereotypes derives from Stanisław Kot, who traced the origins of popular prejudices about other nations from the Middle Ages to the seventeenth century.[4]

1–2 (1989), 125–140. Hopp published extensively on this subject; for a bibliography of his work on Polish-Hungarian relations and its characteristics, see: S. Brzeziński, "A 16.–17. századi lengyel-magyar kapcsolatok Hopp Lajos munkásságában" [Polish-Hungarian relations of the 16th and 17th centuries in the research of Lajos Hopp], *Barokk. Történelem–Irodalom–Művészet*, special issue (2010), 319–327.

[2] J. Tazbir, "Węgry jako symbol i przestroga w literaturze staropolskiej" [Hungary as a symbol and warning in the old Polish literature], in *Prace wybrane*, vol. 3 (Cracow 2001), 433–453 (quotes older literature), first pub. in *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce* 36 (1992), 147–161; S. Grzybowski, "Opinie szlachty polskiej o antyhabsburskich powstaniach na Węgrzech" [The opinion of the Polish nobility on the anti-Habsburg uprisings in Hungary], in *Polska i Węgry w kulturze i cywilizacji europejskiej*, ed. by J. Wyrozumski (Cracow 1997), 83–122. Cf. J. Leszczyński, "The Part Played by the Countries of the Crown of St. Wenceslaus and by Hungary in the Freedom Ideology of the Polish Gentry (1572–1648)," *Otázky dějin střední a východní Evropy. Europae Centralis atque Orientalis Studia Historica* 2 (1975), 25–64.

[3] J. S. Bystroń, *Megalomania narodowa* [The national megalomania] (Warsaw 1935, 2nd ed. 1995); J. Tazbir, "Stosunek do obcych w dobie baroku" [The attitude towards the Other in the age of Baroque], in *Swojskość i cudzoziemszczyzna w dziejach kultury polskiej*, ed. by Z. Stefanowska (Warsaw 1973), 80–112; id., "Ksenofobia w Polsce XVI i XVII wieku" [Xenophobia in Poland in the 16th and 17th century], in *Arianie i katolicy* (Warsaw 1971), 238–278, pub. also as "Początki polskiej ksenofobii" [The beginnings of Polish xenophobia], in *Prace wybrane* 3:367–406; A. Wyczański, "Uwagi o ksenofobii w Polsce XVI wieku" [Remarks on xenophobia in Poland in the 16th century], in *Swojskość*, 68–79.

[4] S. Kot, "Old International Insults and Praises," *Harvard Slavic Studies* 2 (1954), 181–209; id., "Nationum Proprietates," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 6 (1955), 1–43, and vol. 7 (1957), 99–117; id., "Descriptio gentium di poeti polacchi del secolo XVII," *Ricerche Slavistiche* 6 (1958), 150–184, Polish ed.: *Polska złotego wieku a Europa. Studia i szkice* [Poland in the golden age and Europe. Studies and outlines], ed. by H. Barycz (Warsaw 1987).

More recently, the historical research on Polish and Eastern European stereotypes has been more widely developed. A renewed interest in stereotypes as well as in ethnic minorities and historical relations between the neighbouring nations of Central and Eastern Europe emerged after 1989.[5] Scholars of the early modern period refer to divisions between the "familiar" and the "Other" in Poland-Lithuania.[6] On the other hand, a textual approach is presented by linguists, as in the studies of Aleksandra Niewiara, which, however, lack a larger historical context.[7] With the single exception among the aforementioned studies, Polish historical research into stereotypes shows only minor interest in the image of Hungarians and does not focus on it as a separate subject. This can be observed especially in comparison with the more advanced studies on the images of other nations and countries, with a dominance of studies about the image of "Muscovites," Germans, "Turks," Italians and Jews, but also some scholarship on the images of Spaniards, Czechs and Vlachs.[8] Main exceptions are studies

---

[5] Cf. e.g. the volumes: *Stereotypes and Nations*, ed. by T. Walas (Cracow 1995); *Historische Stereotypenforschung. Methodische Überlegungen und empirische Befunde*, ed. by H. H. Hahn (Oldenburg 1995).

[6] *Kultura polityczna w Polsce* [Political culture in Poland], vol. 4, *Swoi i obcy* [Familiars and strangers], pt. 1, ed. by M. Kosman (Poznań 2004); *Staropolski ogląd świata* [The old Polish view of the world], ed. by B. Rok and F. Wolański (Wrocław 2004); *Staropolski ogląd świata. Rzeczpospolita między okcydentalizmem a orientalizacją* [The old Polish view of the world. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth between Occidentalism and Orientalisation], vol. 1, *Przestrzeń kontaktów* [Space of contacts], ed. by F. Wolański and R. Kołodziej (Toruń 2009); *Staropolski ogląd świata. Tożsamość i odmienność* [Old-Polish view of the world. Identity and otherness], ed. by B. Rok and F. Wolański (Toruń 2011).

[7] A. Niewiara, *Wyobrażenia o narodach w pamiętnikach i dziennikach z XVI–XIX wieku* [Representations of nations in memoirs and diaries from the 16th to 19th century] (Katowice 2000); eadem, "Inni w oczach 'wojowników sarmackich'—o stereotypie narodowości w XVII wieku" [The Other in the eyes of the "Sarmatian warriors"—about the stereotype of nationality in the 17th century], in *Stereotyp jako przedmiot lingwistyki. Teoria, metodologia, analizy empiryczne*, ed. by J. Anusiewicz and J. Bartmiński (Wrocław 1998), 171–184.

[8] Some works without an attempt at a full list: K. Maliszewski, *Komunikacja społeczna w kulturze staropolskiej. Studia z dziejów kształtowania się form i treści społecznego przekazu w Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej* [Social communication in Polish culture. Studies on the history of the forms and content of social transfer in the Commonwealth] (Toruń 2001); A. Niewiara, *Moskwicin—Moskal—Rosjanin w dokumentach prywatnych. Portret* [Muscovite—"Moskal"—Russian in private documents. A portrait] (Łódź 2006); eadem, "'The Dear Neighbour,' that 'Vicious Murderer': Imagining 'the Turk' in Polish Language and Culture," in *Imagining 'the Turk*,*'* ed. by B. Jezernik (Newcastle upon Tyne 2010), 149–165; J. Tazbir,

in the field of the comparative history of Polish and Hungarian literature and literary relations, which rather accidentally focused on "historical imagology" in a more comprehensive form.[9] Recently, the image of Hungarians in early modern Poland was also a matter of a more detailed study by Noémi Petneki.[10]

"Obraz Żyda w opinii polskiej XVI–XVIII w." [The image of the Jew in Polish opinion, from the 16th to 18th century], in *Mity i stereotypy w dziejach Polski*, ed. by J. Tazbir (Warsaw 1991), 63–98; P. Tafiłowski, *Imago Turci. Studium z dziejów komunikacji społecznej w dawnej Polsce (1453–1572)* [Imago Turci. A study on the social communication in Poland, 1453–1572] (Lublin 2013); H. Barycz, "Italofilia e italofobia nella Polonia del Cinque e del Seicento," in *Italia, Venezia e Polonia tra umanesimo a rinascimento*, ed. by M. Brahmer (Wrocław 1967), 142–148; W. Tygielski, *Włosi w Polsce XVI–XVII wieku. Utracona szansa na modernizację* [Italians in 16th- and 17th-century Poland. A lost chance for modernisation] (Warsaw 2005); A. Kucharski, *Hiszpania i Hiszpanie w relacjach Polaków. Wrażenia z podróży i pobytu od XVI do początków XIX wieku* [Spain and Spaniards in reports of Poles. Impressions of travel and stay from 16th until the beginning of the 19th century] (Warsaw 2007); *Polaków i Czechów wizerunek wzajemny (X—XVII w.)*[A mutual image of Poles and Czechs, from the 10th to 17th century], ed. by W. Iwańczak and R. Gładkiewicz (Wrocław–Warsaw 2004); J. Porawska, "Stereotypy językowe jako przyczynek do badania stosunków polsko-rumuńskich. Językowo-kulturowy obraz Wołochów i Wołoszczyzny w języku polskim" [Lingual stereotypes as a contribution to the research of Polish-Romanian relations. A lingual-cultural image of Vlachs and Wallachia in the Polish language], in *Kontakty polsko–rumuńskie na przestrzeni wieków. Materiały z sympozjum*, ed. by S. Iachimovschi and E. Wieruszewska (Suceava 2001), 166–179; cf. I. Kąkolewski, *Melancholia władzy. Problem tyranii w europejskiej kulturze politycznej XVI stulecia* [The melancholy of power. The problem of tyranny in the European political culture of the 16th century] (Warsaw 2007), 252–285. Also literature cited above, fns. 5, 6.

[9] J. Ślaski, "Literatura staropolska a literatura starowęgierska" [Old Polish and old Hungarian literature], in *Literatura staropolska w kontekście europejskim (związki i analogie)*, ed. by T. Michałowska and J. Ślaski (Wrocław 1977), 169–199; on bibliographical data, cf. N. Petneki, "A reneszánsz kori lengyel-magyar kapcsolatok kutatástörténete (vázlatos attekintés)" [A history of research on Polish–Hungarian relations in the Renaissance. An overview], *Limes. Tudományos Szemle* 20, 1 (2007), 23–28.

[10] Her unpublished dissertation: N. Petneki, *Węgry i Węgrzy w poezji polskiej XVI–XVII w.* [Hungary and Hungarians in 16th- and 17th-century Polish poetry] (PhD diss., Jagiellonian University of Cracow, 2007), Dokt. 2008/005. I would like to express my gratitude to the author for providing the manuscript. Cf. eadem, "Wacław Potocki és a magyarok" [Wacław Potocki and Hungarians], *Barokk. Történelem–irodalom–művészet*, special issue (2010), 91–107.

For the present study, I chose the functional perspective of stereotype. It seems appropriate to trace the roles of the images evoked in the texts, and also helps to realize their contextual variability and close relation to the empirical. The image of the other—a more general construct, which contains both "inherited" stereotypes and opinions derived from one's own observation—is constantly renewed and updated. It contains stereotypical, more fixed, as well as new elements. Moreover, some of these elements can seem contrary and can be used according to certain aims and contexts.[11] I tend to describe images then not merely as a part of the knowledge about the world, but in their pragmatic role in the discourse. My aim is not to gather as many individual opinions as possible, but to show main tendencies in representation of Hungary and Hungarians. Images of the "Other" can be reasonably studied with a focus on identity, as they are two- or many-sided: they can inform one at least to the same extent about the authors and their community as the imagined one.[12]

A note on representations and identities

A basic question the researcher of stereotypes and representations has to face is: What was the object to which the opinions referred? In other words, what was the described group? Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Polish texts almost unanimously used the word "Hungarians" when referring to inhabitants of the Kingdom of Hungary, meaning its territory from the times before the Ottoman conquest as well.[13] This remained valid

[11] Cf. the paper of Nóra G. Etényi in this volume; see also: I. Bitskey, "Militia et littera. Volkscharakterologische Ungarn-Topoi in der frühen Neuzeit," in *Das Ungarnbild in der deutschen Literatur der frühen Neuzeit: Der Ungarische oder Dacianische Simplicissimus im Kontext barocker Reiseerzählungen und Simpliziaden*, ed. by D. Breuer and G. Tüskés (Bern 2005), 111–124; for general problems of research on stereotypes, see Z. Bokszański, *Stereotypy a kultura* [Stereotypes and culture] (Wrocław 2001).

[12] Cf. J. Leerssen, "Introduction," in *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters: A Critical Survey*, ed. by M. Beller and J. Leerssen (Amsterdam–New York 2007), 28.

[13] On early modern identities in the Carpathian Basin, see I. Bitskey, *Lebensgemeinschaft und nationale Identität. Beiträge der frühneuzeitlichen Kulturgeschichte Ungarns im mitteleuropäischen Kontext* (Vienna 2007); *Whose Love of Which Country? Composite States, National Histories and Patriotic Discourses in Early Modern East Central Europe*, ed. by B. Trencsényi and M. Zászkaliczky (Leiden–Boston 2010); T. Klaniczay, "Die Benennungen 'Hungaria' und 'Pannonia' als Mittel der Identitätssuche der Ungarn," in *Antike Rezeption und*

also concerning non-Hungarian speakers, such as Slovaks or Carpathian Ruthenes.[14] Up to the second half of the eighteenth century the name "Slovak" did not appear in the Polish literature.[15] From the Polish perspective, other nations, both in the Kingdom of Hungary and in the Principality of Transylvania, were characterized in accordance with the set of features attributed to Hungarians, understood not ethnically, but as a political, acting community.[16] Thus, the leaders of these political communities—Hungarian and Transylvanian—were commonly identified as Hungarians, the princes of Transylvania as well. This can be explained largely by the fact—as illustrated by the examples to follow—that the image of the Hungarians in Poland was largely based on an image of nobility and soldiers. Consequently, the division of Hungary—of which the authors were obviously aware—frequently did not seem to play a crucial role in identifying the country and its inhabitants: the borderland both with Habsburg Hungary and Transylvania was called the "Hungarian" side, and travel to Transylvania required passage across the "Hungarian" border.[17]

---

nationale Identität in der Renaissance, ed. by T. Klaniczay et al. (Budapest 1993), 83–110.

[14] Petneki, "Wacław Potocki," 104–105. In the memoirs of Jan Chryzostom Pasek, we read a dialogue with a "Hungarian" (i.e. a servant from Hungary or in a Hungarian-styled uniform), who is apparently speaking Ruthenian: J. Pasek, *Pamiętniki* [The Memoirs], ed. by W. Czapliński (Wrocław 1979), 188; English translation: *The Memoirs of Jan Chryzostom z Gosławic Pasek*, transl. and ed. by M. A. J. Święcicka (New York–Warsaw 1978).

[15] M. Jagiełło, *Słowacy w polskich oczach. Obraz Słowaków w piśmiennictwie polskim* [Slovaks in Polish eyes. The image of Slovaks in Polish literature], vol. 1 (Warsaw 2005), 7.

[16] Cf. the literature quoted in fns. 7 and 9.

[17] "Diariusz Legaciey Pana Jerzego Bałabana starosty Trembowelskiego do Xcia JeMsci Siedmiogrodzkiego Jerzego Rakocego…" [The diary of the legation of Mr Jerzy Bałłaban, starosta of Trembowla, to His Majesty Prince of Transylvania George Rákóczi…], Biblioteka Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Krakowie (Library of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Cracow; hereafter: BPAN Kraków), Ms. 1569, 1^{v} ("our border with Hungary"), 9^{v} ("the mountains separate Poland and Hungary"). E.g. Jakub Łoś, a 17th-century soldier, in his diary wrote only on "Hungarians," referring to Transylvania and the Transylvanians of George Rákóczi II. J. Łoś, *Pamiętnik towarzysza chorągwi pancernej* [The memoirs of a companion of the armoured cavalryman's banner unit], ed. by R. Śreniawa-Szypiowski (Warsaw 2000), 75–78.

The legacy of historiography

One of the main sources of the early modern understanding of identity and the description of other communities was the past. In Polish-Lithuanian public discourse, the set of examples and the historical horizon was obviously based on ancient authors and the Bible, but the country's own history also played a significant role.[18] In shaping this historical imagination, the legacy of late medieval Polish historiography was decisive, which also contained opinions about Hungarians. Similar to the later view of a common past, mutual relations were seen through dynastic ties. The rule of Louis, king of Hungary (1342–1382) and Poland (1370–1382), served frequently as a main example. Jan of Czarnków (1377–1386) in his chronicle harshly criticized his rule.[19] This opinion was upheld also by the main Polish historiographical oeuvre of the fifteenth century, the chronicle of Jan Długosz (1455–1480).[20] Both negatively reflected on the absence of the king, but also on the presence of Hungarians in Poland. Descriptions of anti-Hungarian riots in Cracow in 1376 by Długosz became commonplace. It was repeated by Marcin Bielski (c. 1495–1575), one of the most widely-read Polish early modern historians. He also blamed the Hungarians for thievery, "which is their custom," and ultimately for their own slaughter. Still, these words and other anti-Hungarian sentiments were added in a later edition of the chronicle, completed by Joachim Bielski in the late sixteenth century.[21] It confirms the observation that the attitude towards Hungarians recorded by historiography became more negative in the last dec-

[18] Cf. H.-J. Bömelburg, *Frühneuzeitliche Nationen im östlichen Europa. Das polnische Geschichtsdenken und die Reichweite einer humanistischen Nationalgeschichte (1500–1700)* (Wiesbaden 2006).

[19] Janko z Czarnkowa, *Chronicon Polonorum*, ed. by J. Szlachtowski (Monumenta Poloniae Historica, 2) (Lwów 1872); cf. J. Kłoczowski, "Louis the Great as King of Poland as Seen in the Chronicle of Janko of Czarnkow," in *Louis the Great: King of Hungary and Poland*, ed. by S. B. Vardy et al. (New York 1986), 129–154.

[20] *Joannis Długosii Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, ed. by J. Dąbrowski et al., bks. 1–12 (Warsaw 1964–2005).

[21] M. Bielski, *Kronika wszystkiego świata* [A chronicle of the whole world] (Cracow 1551), 222^{v}–223; id., *Kronika polska* [The Polish chronicle] (Cracow 1597), 248, 250, 257. Cf. J. Tazbir, *Początki*, 394–396; D. Bagi, "Nagy Lajos lengyelországi uralmának megítélése a lengyel történetírásban" [Opinion on the Polish reign of Louis the Great in Polish historiography], in *Híd a századok felett. Tanulmányok Katus László 70. születésnapjára*, ed. by P. Hanák and M. Nagy (Pécs 1997), 101–112; Petneki, *Węgry*, 45–52. The quotations in the text, unless otherwise noted, are translated by the author.

ades of the sixteenth century.[22] As I point out further, this fact can be explained by more intensive contacts and therefore also conflicts during the rule of Stephen Báthory, where we see the influence of propaganda and changes in the European image of Hungarians.

Louis was for a long time an example of the disadvantages of foreign monarchs, inaccessible and favouring their compatriots over native nobility. Interestingly, this did not apply to his daughter Hedwig. Długosz also negatively judged King Matthias Corvinus, a rival of the Jagiellons in reigning over Hungary. This opinion proved to be crucial for most of Polish sixteenth-century historiography.[23] It seems, however, that this view of King Matthias—due to a less frequent presence of this figure in the public discourse—did not influence the image of the whole nation. Only some pleas against Corvinus fitted into the general image of Hungarians, such as blaming him for neglecting the fight against the Ottomans. This corresponded with similar accusations raised against Hungarians, as part of a broader narrative indicating their responsibility for the fall of the kingdom. The image of a "cruel," "invasive" and even tyrannical King Matthias, still alive in the Długosz-based historiography of the sixteenth century (Marcin Kromer, Maciej of Miechów and Marcin Bielski), was less popular in contemporary political writings, a kind of literature which developed widely in the second half of the sixteenth century, especially during the turmoil of the *interregna* after the death of the last Jagiellon in 1572. In contrast, the memory of King Louis' reign was evoked as an argument in actual discussions on government. This period was considered as the beginning of the Polish nobility's *ius resistandi* (right to resist). The legendary rebellion *(rokosz)* of Gliniany, which was thought to have occurred during Angevin rule in Poland, was a very popular topos in late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century political pamphlets.[24] According to a ficti-

---

[22] E. Dubas-Urwanowicz, "Swój i obcy w historiografii polskiej XVI wieku" [The familiar and the other in Polish historiography of the 16th century], in *Samoidentyfikacja mniejszości narodowych i religijnych w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej. Historia i historiografia*, ed. by J. Lewandowski and W. Goleman (Lublin 1999), 66–67.

[23] K. Baczkowski, "Maciej Korwin, król Węgier (1458–1490) w opinii historiografii staropolskiej" [Matthias Corvinus, king of Hungary in the opinion of old Polish historiography], in *Aetas media—aetas moderna. Studia ofiarowane profesorowi Henrykowi Samsonowiczowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, ed. by H. Manikowska et al. (Warsaw 2000), 363–374.

[24] K. Baczkowski, "Dwie tradycje rządów andegaweńskich 1370–1386 w piśmiennictwie staropolskim" [Two traditions of Angevin rule, 1370–1386, in old Polish literature], *Annales Academiae Paedagogicae Cracoviensis* 21 (2004),

tious story, the king, forced by the resistance of the Polish nobility, withdrew his despotic orders as well as Hungarian countrymen from Polish offices. It was true, however, that he granted a fiscal privilege in Kassa (Košice) in Hungary in 1374. That is why some authors, like Łukasz Górnicki (1527–1603), derived "Polish freedom" from King Louis.[25] Positive evaluation of the story tempered the critical view of this period, but did not essentially change the image of King Louis and the Polish–Hungarian union. The inherited opinion was still at this point far from the view of an ever-strong relationship, and yet it still co-existed with the tradition of *conformitas*.

Between compassion and criticism: Hungary in the political debate

The fall of medieval Hungary had significant repercussions in neighbouring Poland. For many decades after 1526, the Ottoman threat was considered real and became a frequent argument in internal political discussions. The historical example merged with a new, almost contemporary one, as current events were seen as a consequence of recent history. Hungary served as an example of a well-known country, still mighty in popular remembrance, which turned into a permanent battlefield, located in the close vicinity. This resulted in the notion of a Hungary as a warning, which was largely based on the aforementioned topos (and thereafter, a myth) of "bulwark." In the Polish opinion the fall of Buda in 1541 drew at least the same attention as the Battle of Mohács in 1526. This is indicated by the popularity of a poem *Cantio de Hungaria occupata*, written directly after the dramatic events of 1541, and published in Cracow in 1558.[26] Several different manuscript versions have been preserved, the text was even set music.[27] The poem is predominantly moralistic, kept in the convention of

Studia Historica 3, 33–43; cf. D. Bagi, "Nagy Lajos," 45–60; Petneki, "Wacław Potocki," 94–96.

[25] Ł. Górnicki, "Droga do zupełnej wolności" [A road to complete freedom], in *Droga do zupełnej wolności. Rozmowa o elekcji, wolności, prawie i obyczajach polskich*, ed. by A. Kuczkiewicz-Fraś (Cracow 2011), 36.

[26] *Pieśń o posiedzeniu i o zniewoleniu żałosnym ziemie węgierskiej…* [A song on the conquest and lamentable enslavement of the Hungarian land] (Cracow, c. 1558), National Library, Warsaw (hereafter: BN), XVI.0.261.

[27] H. Kapełuś, "Cantio de Hungaria occupata," *Pamiętnik Literacki* 51, 4 (1960), 411–434 (contains the text and gathers earlier scholarship). The possible author was Stanisław Kleryka from Bochnia, friend of Piotr Porembski, who witnessed the events in Hungary in 1540s as a secretary of Queen Isabela of Jagiellon.

repentant lament. The main notion is the Ottoman threat: "the laws of Hungarian lords / are for nothing, they ceased, / the Hungarian remained with nothing, / the Turk deliberates on the field of Rákos."[28] Hungary serves as an example of a once mighty kingdom, symbolized here by self-governance and parliamentary traditions, which was led to ruin by its sins: greed and pride of the "rich Hungarians." Instead of "true council," enslaved Hungary is—among numerous plagues—a land of treason and unbelief. Therefore, the solution is to pray and atone. From the beginning of the partition of Hungary, the Hungarian theme was then closely connected with a moral warning. It emerged from the notion of Ottoman threat, frequently used also in Polish *Turcica* literature and preaching.

This above literary example, although published under the impact of actual events and of an evidently pro-Habsburg attitude, still seemed to lack a very apparent current political purpose. That was not the case with the Neo-Latin literature, which also raised the Hungarian theme in the 1540s, but used it for more than simply a moral example. The poetry of Clemens Janicius (1516–1543) is a case and point. Janicius was one of the first poets in Poland to mourn the collapse of the Kingdom of Hungary. His call—"The good of Pannonia is your good, O Poles, because the Sarmatian sails on the same boat"—expressed an opinion on Hungarian matters that became very common in the following decades.[29] Compassion towards Hungarians merged with a political anti-Ottoman goal, found in the collection of poems, *Pannoniae luctus*, published in Cracow in 1544.[30] From the mid-sixteenth century, the example of Hungary started to be widely used as a warning and also a call for political consent in Polish political theory (e.g. Andrzej Frycz-Modrzewski), and at the same time entered the public debate, as reflected in the diets of the 1550s.[31]

However, the political use of Hungarian topics was not limited to the anti-Ottoman sense. Hungary was seen not only as a place "where the

---

[28] Kapełuś, "Cantio," 414.

[29] Ibid., 419; C. Janicius, *Carmina*, ed. by L. Ćwikliński (Cracow 1930), 43; Tafiłowski, *Imago Turci*, 191–193; N. Petneki, "Mohács i jego następstwa w twórczości poetyckiej humanisty Klemensa Janickiego" [Mohács and its consequences in the poetry of the humanist Clemens Janicius], in *Węgiersko-polskie więzi historyczne w X–XVI wieku. Magyar-lengyel történelmi kapcsolatok a X–XVI. században*, ed. by A. Nagy and L. Ábrán (Budapest 2003), 175–192 (also in Hungarian); cf. Tazbir, "Węgry," 439–440.

[30] B. Lakatos, "Pannoniae luctus—egy humanista antológia és a törökellenes Habsburg-lengyel összefogás kísérlete, 1544" [Pannoniae luctus—a humanist anthology and an attempt of anti-Turkish Habsburg–Polish collaboration], *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 112, 3 (2008), 259–286.

[31] Grzybowski, "Opinie," 86.

Turk stays," but as a subject of Habsburg rule as well. It served then as an argument in internal debates. The period of the first *interregna* (1572–1573, 1574–1575/76) resulted in an essential growth of political polemics. The debate about candidates involved the Habsburgs: Archduke Ernest (1553–1595) and Emperor Maximilian II (1527–1576).[32] The attitude towards them influenced the image of Hungary. Their followers stressed Hungarian guilt for loss of independence and the ability of the House of Habsburg to govern and maintain the remaining territory of the Kingdom of Hungary and defend it against Ottomans. Contrary to the Ottoman rule, the Habsburgs were seen by their adherents as milder sovereigns, ruling with the permission of their subjects.[33] Nevertheless, more suggestive and widespread was the opinion of Hungary as an example and warning of Habsburg tyranny. The dynasty was accused of introducing its own political model, promoting its own people (Germans), fiscal oppression and limiting religious freedom.[34] The situation of the Kingdom of Hungary was examined in relation to Silesia and the Netherlands, but above all in connection to Bohemia. In the popular political writings, both countries were seen as a part of the Habsburg dominion. Therefore, in the modern history writing these two examples were described together as the "Bohemian–Hungarian argument."[35] Until the end of the sixteenth century, sympathy towards those "oppressed countries" seemed to prevail over criticism. It was closely connected with the political program of the middle nobility. This so-called executionist movement, which had reached its peak in the 1560s and 1570s, concentrated on its rights and its position against magnates.[36] In the rhetoric of the movement's followers, an analogy to Hungary and the stereotype of Habsburg tyranny was used among other historical and contemporary references to strengthen its argumentation. Parallel to usage of the Hungarian argument for pro- or anti-

---

[32] Cf. A. Bues, *Die habsburgische Kandidatur für den polnischen Thron während des ersten Interregnums in Polen 1572/73* (Vienna 1984); Ch. Augustynowicz, *Die Kandidaten und Interessen des Hauses Habsburg in Polen-Litauen während des zweiten Interregnums 1574–1576* (Vienna 2001).

[33] *Pisma polityczne z czasów pierwszego bezkrólewia* [Political writings of the first interregnum], ed. by J. Czubek (Cracow 1906), 698.

[34] Ibid., 350, 390 ff., 422, 457, 461, 492, 635 ff., 697; cf. S. Brzeziński, "Tyran i tyrania w staropolskim języku politycznym (XVI—XVII w.)" [The tyrant and tyranny in old Polish-language of politics, 16th and 17th century], in *Społeczeństwo staropolskie. Seria nowa*, vol. 1, ed. by A. Karpiński and I. Dacka-Górzyńska (Warsaw 2008), 314–315; Grzybowski, "Opinie," 90–93; I. Kąkolewski, *Melancholia*, 267–270.

[35] Cf. J. Leszczyński, "The Part" (extensively quotes from the political writings).

[36] *Polaków i Czechów wizerunek*; J. Leszczyński, "The Part."

Habsburg propaganda, it served internal political goals as well. A good example of such a practice is a speech of King Stephen Báthory to the Diet of 1585: the king himself argued against his opponents by pointing to his fatherland, which perished because of internal disunity.[37]

The anti-Habsburg moods remained alive in the first half of the reign of King Sigismund III (1587–1632). The king in his first years was accused of planning to hand over the crown to the Habsburgs, the leader of the opposition became the mighty Chancellor Jan Zamoyski, who frequently used the anti-Habsburg rhetoric. This also resulted in a broader usage of the "Hungarian example." A significant change can be observed in the image of Hungary at the beginning of seventeenth century. From a country generally treated with compassion—even if politically motivated—and therefore playing mostly a passive role between the two tyrannies, Ottoman or Habsburg (according to the standpoint), Hungary began to be considered more frequently as an actor. No doubt, it happened also under the impact of the policy of Prince Sigismund Báthory, the Long Turkish War (1591/93–1606) and, later, Stephen Bocskai's revolt (1604–1606) and Gabriel Bethlen's military campaigns (1619–1620, 1623–1624, 1626). The writings from the time of the rebellion against Sigismund III (1606–1609) showed this ambiguous usage of the Hungarian topic in the political struggle. On the one hand, still alive was the image of Hungary and Transylvania as victims of domestic and external division as well—in this case, Jesuits and Habsburgs, who were blamed for their collapse and chaos.[38] On the other hand, the topic of "Hungarian disunion," inspired by actual events like the Bocskai revolt, further evolved and resulted in a more negative image. In the early seventeenth century, Poland supported the argument for internal unity against anti-royal opposition: Hungarians lost their kingdom to civil war and in calling foreigners for help, thus, questioning the legitimacy of their own legal ruler would lead to the same misery.[39] Hungary was seen by the adherents of the king as a country allied with the Ottomans, from whom can be expected danger rather than help: in Hungary "Turks and Tatars are living as at home," and they "became brothers, even made a match with Hungarians."[40] An additional character-

[37] *Diariusze sejmowe r. 1585* [Records of the 1585 diet], ed. by A. Czuczyński (Scriptores Rerum Polonicarum, 18) (Cracow 1901), 34.
[38] *Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu Zebrzydowskiego 1606–1608* [Political writings from the time of Zebrzydowski's rebellion 1606–1608], ed. by J. Czubek, vols. 1–3 (Cracow 1916–1918), 1:4, 94; 2:425–426, 457, 468–469; 3:33–49, passim.
[39] Ibid., 1:142; 2:300, 327–328, 459.
[40] Ibid., 2:222.

istic of Hungarians appeared: they are rebels, causing dangerous turmoil and deposing rulers. In one of the dialogues from the early seventeenth century, the need for a Diet in Cracow was argued for by the fact that "here nearby, in Hungary, we have rebels, close to our border Bocskai quarrels with Basta." The implication was that if such as these two argue, one can be affected for no apparent reason at all; they can soon betray a neighbour and disturb their peace and liberty.[41] According to this view, Stephen Bocskai was depicted negatively as a traitor, while the anti-royal opposition associated him with the fight for liberty and fatherland.[42] Like the image of Hungarians, the figure of the Transylvanian prince was an instrument in internal controversy—the royal side accused its foes of planning to replace the king with Bocskai, or at least use his military's help, which they firmly denied. This image clearly was shaped by the needs of the actual political and military conflict in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but one should also consider the influence of the Habsburg propaganda describing Hungarians as rebels.

Undoubtedly, such negative opinions also had deeper roots, namely, the late medieval popular characteristics of nations—moreover, frequently originating from German-speaking territories—which mostly described Hungarians as "unfaithful" and "rebellious." A similar set of accusations was repeated in early modern Polish poems of this kind, which contributed to the range of this "Hungarian" feature in political literature and pamphlets and therefore kept the stereotype alive.[43] Interestingly, some similar accusations can be found in the Hungarian image of the Poles. The Transylvanian Hungarians visiting Poland in the first half of the seventeenth century blamed the inhabitants of the country for the same characteristic—being factious and rebellious—which was often attributed to them.[44] Thus,

---

[41] *Literatura mieszczańska w Polsce od końca XVI w. do końca XVII w.* [Burgher literature in Poland from the end of the 16th until the end of the 17th century], ed. by K. Budzyk et al., vols. 1–2 (Warsaw 1954), 1:188–189 (A. Władysławiusz, *Dialog albo rozmowa*).

[42] *Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu*, 1:129; 2:118, 460 (negatively), 294 (positively). Cf. K. Teszelszky and M. Zászkaliczky, "A Bocskai-felkelés és az európai információhálózatok (Hírek, diplomácia és politikai propaganda, 1604–1606)" [Bocskai's revolt and the European information networks (News, diplomacy and political propaganda, 1604–1606)], *Aetas* 27, 4 (2012), 79–80, 85–86.

[43] Kot, "Old International Insults and Praises"; id., "Nationum Proprietates."

[44] G. Kármán, "Identity and Borders: Seventeenth-Century Hungarian Travellers in the West and East," *European Review of History. Revue européenne d'histoire* 17, 4 (2010), 563.

the stereotypical mutual similarity seems to have extended even over the set of critical remarks.

Soldiers, robbers and the stench of garlic

In the aforementioned political debates, Hungary was portrayed in a more general light, mostly as a simplified image, adjusted to the inherited topics and political goals of the author. From the late sixteenth century, an individualized image became more widespread, based on real contacts and accompanied by fading anti-Habsburg stereotypes. Accordingly, Hungarians were frequently seen and judged as soldiers. Clear evidence of cultural exchange in this field exists in the form of a number of military loanwords in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Polish, borrowed from Hungarian, or indirectly from oriental languages. Especially in seventeenth-century Polish a Hungarian soldier was called with separate words: "katan" (derived from the Hungarian "katona"—"soldier") or "sabat"/"sabot" (Hung. "szabad"—"free," i.e. freely enrolled, volunteer).[45] The image of internal Hungarian discord influenced opinion on Hungarians' military skills. Already in a chronicle from the mid-sixteenth century, the lack of consent between Hungarians was seen as a main cause of misfortune in wars with Ottomans. Hungarians were said to fight "sluggishly."[46] In the next decades, Poles could form their own opinion in the matter. In Poland, inhabitants of different parts of historical Hungary were enrolled in royal and private armies since the late Middle Ages. Their number increased in 1570s–80s, mainly due to close ties under the reign of Stephen Báthory (1576–1586). In the seventeenth century, the Hungarian enrolment lost its significance.[47] The Transylvanian troops who took part in Báthory's wars against Muscovy (1577–1582), in spite of their bravery, did not leave behind very

[45] Niewiara, *Wyobrażenia*, 201; Bystroń, *Megalomania*, 76; K. Török, "Polsko-węgierskie, węgiersko-polskie kontakty językowe–historia i współczesność" [Polish–Hungarian and Hungarian–Polish linguistic contacts: history and present], *Studia Pragmalingwistyczne* 1 (2009), 169, 174–176.

[46] *Kronika od r. 1507 do 1541 spisana (z rękopismu 1549 r.)* [A chronicle of years 1507–1541 from the manuscript of 1549], ed. by K. W. Wójcicki (Biblioteka Starożytna Pisarzy Polskich, 6) (Warsaw 1844), 16; cf. Niewiara, *Wyobrażenia*, 198–199.

[47] M. Plewczyński, *W służbie polskiego króla. Z zagadnień struktury narodowościowej armii koronnej w latach 1500–1574* [In the service of the Polish king. The national structure of the royal army, 1500–1574] (Siedlce 1995), 117–135; id., *Wojny i wojskowość polska w XVI wieku* [Polish wars and warfare in the 16th century], vol. 3, *1576–1599* (Zabrze–Tarnowskie Góry 2013), 35.

good memories. Complaints were expressed about their greed, like in the diary of priest Jan Piotrowski, an eyewitness of Báthory's campaign. He stated that "Hungarians are angry at us, as we did not grant them any castles [in Livonia]. We quarrel with them very much."[48] Similar opinions can be found, for example, in the diary of hetman Stanisław Żółkiewski, commander in the war against Muscovy in 1609–1611, writing about "riotous and immoral" Hungarians in Polish service.[49] However, lack of discipline was of course by no means an unusual problem in warfare, using ethnically heterogeneous armies, and therefore insubordination cannot be understood as a specifically Hungarian feature. In fact, for Polish nobility, even more shocking news was to come later, as in case of the Transylvanian raid in 1610 on the southern borderland. The complaints of local diets were repeated also in forthcoming years.[50] They disseminated the stereotype of Hungarians as robbers, like in a polemical Latin piece by Szymon Starowolski (c. 1587–1656), who enumerated the disadvantages of other nations, stating "we are not used to practicing robbery and pillaging, like the Hungarians."[51] Turmoil along the southern border made the Polish side more suspicious in relations with Hungary and Transylvania, during and after the Thirty Years' War—a conflict in which the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Principality of Transylvania found themselves on opposite sides.

In the popular literature we find evidence of sometimes difficult relationships with southern neighbours and a common image of them. A typical plea included that of slave trade or theft of horses and cattle. Sebastian Fabian Klonowic (c. 1545–1602) in his collection of poems *Worek Judaszów* (Sack of Judases, 1600), among other criminals, depicted a thief, riding through dangerous borderland areas: the Tatra Mountains and the Stryi River, which directly indicated Hungarian or Transylvanian subjects. They were also blamed by him for the slave trade, realized in a treacherous way: by attracting people to taverns, making them drunk, kidnapping them and getting them "on the Turkish side," which meant selling them to

---

[48] J. Piotrowski, *Dziennik wyprawy Stefana Batorego pod Psków* [The diary of the campaign of Stephen Báthory to Pskov], ed. by A. Czuczyński (Cracow 1894), 213.

[49] S. Żółkiewski, *Początek i progres wojny moskiewskiej* [The beginning and progress of the Muscovite war], ed. by J. Maciszewski (Warsaw 1966), 114–115, 188.

[50] Grzybowski, "Opinie," 108–109.

[51] S. Starowolski, "Mowa przeciw oszczercom Polski" [A speech against the defamers of Poland], in *Wybór z pism*, ed. by I. Lewandowski (Wrocław 1991), 193, orig. ed.: *Declamatio contra obtrectatores Poloniae* (Cracow 1631).

Buda.[52] Such an image could diffuse effectively, as the book had four editions in the next seven years. In the popular and mostly anonymous satirical war news, commonly written in the form of a dialogue, we read about the corrupt manners of Hungarian soldiers. A "beer war" shall kill them rather than the Turk—states the Priest in a dialogue with a figure typical for that literature, called Albertus—"they blunt their weapons rather on them than on Turk," courageous in feast, but not in the battle.[53] The Hungarians appeared here as soldiers motivated only by profit, while being afraid of attacking the Ottomans.[54]

The Long Turkish War undoubtedly fixed the associations of Hungary as a land of conflict and of Hungarians as unreliable men of arms. How strong this association could be, is showed by the example of Adam Czahrowski (c. 1565–after 1599), who spent several years in Hungarian military service at that time. Although he got to know his Hungarian brothers in arms much better than other Polish noblemen and spoke Hungarian, he expressed divergent opinions in his poetry, both praising the bravery of soldiers and the charm of the country while also criticising its "deceitful" people of insufficient virtue. In his case, an inconsistency in his image of Hungary and Hungarians can be regarded as evidence of how lively the older stereotypes were, but can be understood also according to the categories of author and audience: the goal to deliver an attractive image of Hungarians prevailed.[55]

Criticism of Hungarian military skill was of course not always as severe as in the quoted satirical pieces. It is however noteworthy that a distance was expressed even in far more moderated texts, like in the diary of Jakub Sobieski (1591–1646), a prominent politician and senator, a man well-educated and of considerable international experience. In 1638 he accompanied the royal couple, Ladislaus IV and Cecilia Renata of Austria, on their journey to Baden in Lower Austria. He visited the Hungarian Palatine Miklós Esterházy in Eisenstadt on the occasion of the wedding of the palatine's son, István, where he represented the king. He judged the troops accompanying the ceremony as follows:

---

[52] *Literatura mieszczańska*, 1:161, 164–165. Cf. G. Pálffy, "Ransom Slavery along the Ottoman-Hungarian Frontier in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in *Ransom Slavery along the Ottoman Borders (Early Fifteenth–Early Eighteenth Centuries)*, ed. by G. Dávid and P. Fodor (Leiden–Boston–Cologne 2007), 35–83.

[53] *Literatura mieszczańska*, 2:192–193, 195–196 (*Albertus z wojny*, 1596).

[54] Ibid., 2:199–200.

[55] Petneki, *Węgry*, 17, 106–109, 123–124. A. Czahrowski, *Treny i rzeczy rozmaite (1597)* [The threnodies and various verses], ed. by T. Mikulski (Warsaw 1937), I 20, II 52, v. 71–72.

> There was a cavalry, as they counted, of eight-hundred men; but as it happened at night, some of us suspected that they entered the castle twice, to make the number of them seem greater. The horses, in comparison to ours, were quite poor, and the lances, or rather saplings, without panaches. Most of the *katan*s wore wolfskins, some of them were dressed in tiger and leopard skins. The saddles, of whatever kind, and the men were not dressed elegantly.[56]

A few years later another Polish nobleman, Jerzy Bałłaban, who travelled as an envoy to another Hungarian wedding held in Alba Iulia in 1643, namely that of the younger George Rákóczi, son of the prince of Transylvania, George Rákóczi I, criticized the Hungarian ceremonial troops even more strongly. As he noted, the soldiers of the princely court appeared at the feast in torn clothes and poor shoes.[57] However, to describe this relationship properly, we should keep in mind that almost nothing satisfied the author in Transylvania, and his diary is full of bitter complaints and disappointment with food, accommodation and the people.

A negative image of Hungarians in Poland was expanded in the mid-seventeenth century by a topic of an odd nature: their smell. According to several testimonies from literary sources and diaries, a Hungarian's indispensable feature was the odour of garlic. Wacław Potocki (1621–1696), one of main figures of the seventeenth-century Polish Baroque literature, in the dedication to his epic *Transakcja wojny chocimskiej* (The progress of the Khotyn war), states, "Crush the Hungarian in mortar, do what you want with him, he will still stink of garlic as before," which is a part of a critique of kings of foreign origin.[58] The topic appears regularly in references to the prince of Transylvania, George Rákóczi II (1621–1660). In Potocki's satirical epitaph of the prince, Rákóczi estimated his richness and glory by his view of pigs, oxen and "plenty of garlic." Elsewhere he used also a seemingly popular saying, "you stink of musk as a Hungarian

---

[56] J. Sobieski, "Droga do Baden (1638)" [A journey to Baden, 1638], in *Peregrynacja po Europie (1607–1613) i podróż do Baden (1638)*, ed. by J. Długosz (Wrocław 1991), 250.

[57] *Diariusz Legaciey*, f. 3^v–4^v, cf. the Hung. ed.: *II. Rákóczy György esküvője. Bałłaban György lengyel követ naplója. Forrásközlés* [The wedding of George Rákóczi II. The diary of the Polish envoy Jerzy Bałłaban. Text edition], ed. by G. Várkonyi (Budapest 1990).

[58] W. Potocki, *Wojna chocimska* [The Khotyn war], ed. by A. Brückner (Cracow 1924), 370; Petneki, "Wacław Potocki," 94.

of garlic."[59] The noble, soldier and memoirist Jan Chryzostom Pasek (c. 1636–1701) noted about the prince that "he was fed up with peace and acquired a fancy for some Polish garlic, which somebody praised for him in jest, saying that it was better tasting than the Hungarian […] In Poland he was not only given garlic, but a hard time as well." He continued the metaphor, stating that through the war, instead of expected spoils, he brought misery, mourning and death to his compatriots, and all that, together with his collapse and death: "that's garlic for you!"[60] Both authors used the popular stereotype as an instrument in constructing a satire of actual or past events, with outstandingly scornful opinion on the prince and Hungarians.

The invasion of Poland in 1657 by George Rákóczi II had of course a negative impact on the image of Hungarians in the commonwealth. The general image was somehow different from the opinions about other enemies of the commonwealth in the wars of the mid-seventeenth century, like Cossacks, Swedes and Muscovites. The abrupt campaign was seen together with its consequences: the defeat of the Transylvanian army, its enslavement by the Tatars and the retaliatory Polish raid against Transylvania. Thus, the evaluation tended to be contemptuous and also moralistic. The notion of a Hungarian robber gained an unquestionable basis. Additionally, Hungarians started to be characterized as people of low social origin, deprived of noble features ("mob," "primitive robbers"), and associated with their "Hunnic" origins.[61] This fact notwithstanding, an interesting dualism can be observed in the image of Hungarians. Critical remarks reached both the prince and his compatriots, but the sharp criticism concentrated rather on Rákóczi himself, only incidentally on some of his main commanders. As quoted above, in satirical texts the prince was equipped with the negative prejudices contra Hungarians, like those of poor military skills, greed and treachery. Attempting to gain the Polish throne, he was considered to be simply chasing a wild-goose and therefore appeared not as a threat but merely as a "Hungarian thief, the mad Rákóczi," "clown" and pitiful case: "And when he pays the Poles for his life with gold, / he will admit that [it is] better to fight the Vlachs, a fool. / It was good for you, little Hungarian, to plant the vine, / and not to argue with the old

[59] Petneki, "Wacław Potocki," 101; *Nowa księga przysłów polskich* [New book of Polish sayings], ed. by J. Krzyżanowski, vols. 1–3 (Warsaw 1969–1972), 2:949; 3:646.
[60] J. Pasek, *Pamiętniki*, 8–10 (*The Memoirs*, 74, 76).
[61] Petneki, "Wacław Potocki," 100 (also by Wespazjan Kochowski); eadem, *Węgry*, 93–94.

neighbours."[62] Lines by Wespazjan Kochowski (1633–1700), who himself took part in the revenge raid against Transylvania, depict Rákóczi—"an inept commander" and "tyrant"—trembling in reaction to the attack of hetman Stefan Czarniecki, letting his officers be taken as hostages instead of him, while fleeing "timidly, without drawing his sword."[63] Transylvanians were described also as wild, unprofessional soldiers, but basically treated with disrespect and irony. This image often served for comic rather than fear-provoking effect. Father Adrian Pikarski, who witnessed the capitulation of the Transylvanian army, being aware of its cruelty, expressed in his diary even compassion to the "poor Hungarians"—a notion which was present also in the scoffing passages of other authors.[64] In a short Latin poem, the prince was blamed for the misfortune of Transylvania, but his people appeared as miserable, mourning and complaining about him.[65] It is characteristic that in the political journalism of the 1650s and 1660s the Hungarian example appeared far more occasionally. Hungary still served as a memorable historical case: the well-established topic was stretched to contain also the contemporary failure of Rákóczi's campaign in Poland. Like earlier, it was strictly connected to the actual political controversy, the attempts of King John Casimir to ensure the succession of Louis Prince of Condé in the mid-1660s, or—from the other side—against the adversary of the king, hetman Jerzy Lubomirski, who earlier led the Polish revenge raid on Transylvania in 1657.[66]

A more established negative stereotype of Hungarian soldiers and warfare emerged in the characterisation of *kuruc* troops, who fought in the second half of seventeenth and at the beginning of the eighteenth century against the Habsburg side along the Carpathian Basin, but above all in Transylvanian service. In Polish sources they were depicted rather critically, as "rebels," also because of their less knightly tactic. No doubt it was

---

[62] W. Potocki, *Dzieła* [Collected works], ed. by L. Kukulski (Warsaw 1987), 1:457; Petneki, "Wacław Potocki," 101; J. Pasek, *The Memoirs*, 74.

[63] W. Kochowski, *Psalmodia polska oraz wybór liryków i fraszek* [Polish psalmody and a collection of lyrics], ed. by J. Krzyżanowski (Cracow 1926), 63–64 (*Proporzec nieumierającej sławy… Stefana Czarnieckiego…*, v. 109–114).

[64] A. Pikarski, "Diarium bellici progressus cum Georgio Rakocio," in B. Kalicki, *Ksiądz Adrian Pikarski i jego Dziennik wyprawy przeciw Rakocemu r. 1657* (Lwów 1864), 256, 258; Petneki, *Węgry*, 93; Grzybowski, "Opinie," 109.

[65] "Lachrimae afflictae Hungariae," BPAN Kraków, Ms 2254, 37^{v}–38^{r} (microfilm: BN, Mf. 31188).

[66] *Pisma polityczne z czasów panowania Jana Kazimierza Wazy, 1648–1668* [Political writings from the reign of John Casimir Vasa], vols. 1–3, ed. by S. Ochmann-Staniszewska (Wrocław 1989–1991), 2:190, 261, 3:64; Kochowski, *Psalmodia*, 63 (v. 101–104).

also a consequence of the alliance of Emmerich Thököly with Ottomans in the wars against the Christian league in 1683–1684. Pasek noted in a description of the events of 1683 that during their march through the mountains of Upper Hungary, they were constantly attacked by Hungarian *kuruc* troops, who kidnapped and killed the servants, robbed the supplies and fled back to the mountains. The hostility to them went so far, that the Poles, forced by the muddy weather to leave some precious boots won by Vienna, decided rather to destroy them than to let them fall into Hungarian hands.[67]

At that time the image of Hungarians in Europe generally worsened due to the Thököly's Ottoman alliance. In Poland-Lithuania, it could not be positive also because of the huge impact the victory of Vienna had on domestic opinion and the key role it played in royal propaganda.[68] The negative attitude towards Hungarians and Transylvanians, which arose in the time of Rákóczi's war against Poland, was then strengthened: a clear proof is found in the manuscript newspapers from the 1680s.[69] A stereotypical figure of the "traitorous" "rebel" Hungarian survived in Polish folklore up until the nineteenth century.[70] Although the political events were crucial for this trend, the growing antipathy also had clear confessional causes dating back to the early seventeenth century.

Divided in politics, divided in faith?

The notion of Hungarian disunity, based firstly on the actual partition of the country, soon found strong corroboration from the fact of religious di-

[67] Pasek, *The Memoirs*, 496. Cf. the robbery of Upper Hungary by the Polish and Lithuanian army in 1683: W. Semkowicz, "Udział wojsk litewskich Sobieskiego w kampanji roku 1683" [The participation of Sobieski's Lithuanian army in the 1683 campaign], *Ateneum Wileńskie* 9 (1933–1934), 129–158, 199–201.

[68] Cf. B. Köpeczi, *"Magyarország a kereszténység ellensége." A Thököly-felkelés az európai közvéleményben* ["Hungary, an enemy of Christianity." The rebellion of Thököly in the European public opinion] (Budapest 1976); L. Hopp, "A felszabadító háborúk tükröződése a lengyel irodalomban. A bécsi diadaltól Buda visszavívásáig, 1683–1686" [The reflection of liberation wars in Polish literature. From the victory of Vienna to the recapture of Buda], *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 90, 3 (1983), 275–290; Grzybowski, "Opinie," 113–121; Petneki, *Węgry*, 95–102.

[69] B. Popiołek, "Tematyka węgierska w polskich gazetach rękopiśmiennych z przełomu XVII i XVIII wieku" [The Hungarian topics in the Polish manuscript newspapers at the turn of the 17th and 18th centuries], *Annales Academiae Paedagogicae Cracoviensis. Studia Historica* 1 (2001), 22–23.

[70] Grzybowski, "Opinie," 110.

versity. Both divisions, political and confessional, were often perceived jointly, especially if it fitted as an argument into religious controversies. The accusation of the "rebellious" nature of Hungarians could be easily adapted in such a narrative, as well. Criticism of the supposed Hungarian "heresy" appeared in Poland-Lithuania at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century and can be explained by an increasing role of religious tensions and attempts at re-Catholicisation under Sigismund III (1587–1632). Even then, the accusation against Hungarians due to their heterodoxy appeared rather as another aspect of the political split and conflict between Christians and Ottomans.[71] The internal conflict between Hungarians and their "betrayals" were derived from the devils' incitement, just as any other civil war. The popular opinion on the Hungarians' attitude towards religion was traced back from the negative image of Hungarian soldiers.[72] In the first phase of the Thirty Years' War, the Latin writings were more moderate in their evaluation of the Transylvanian side, but those written in Polish revealed greater antagonism[73]—in reference to the literary comments on the Polish engagement in the war on the Habsburg side. An extreme example of identifying Hungarians with heresy can be found in Wojciech Dembołęcki's apology of Polish-Lithuanian mercenary troops (1623), who helped Ferdinand II in the struggle against Protestant allies, among them the prince of Transylvania, Gabriel Bethlen, in the first phase of the Thirty Years' War. Bethlen's army was portrayed in a highly disrespectful manner as a rebellious heretic mob, the prince himself as a "snake," guarding his pit. In the role of a positive Hungarian, the author cast György Drugeth of Homonna, "a man of great zeal," who brought the Poles military aid.[74] A negative image of Bethlen as a heretic ruler appeared also in newspapers, similarly in a strong political context and not necessarily with an appraisal of the Polish cavalry troops. In a print from 1620, Bethlen is alleged to be a defender of Islam, killing his predecessor and obtaining the throne through treachery. Though Bohemia is granted the main role as a heretical land, Transylvania and its ruler definitely belong to a hostile camp, which was primarily defined as Protestant. In another propagandistic print from 1620, the Transylvanian army was

[71] As by Jan Jurkowski (c. 1580–1639) and other authors, cf. Petneki, *Węgry*, 28, 119, 122–123; Leszczyński, "The Part," 52–53.
[72] *Literatura mieszczańska*, 2:60, 192.
[73] Grzybowski, "Opinie," 101.
[74] W. Dembołęcki, *Przewagi elearów polskich, co ich niegdy lisowczykami zwano* [The victories of the Polish *elears*, called once *lisowczycy*], ed. by R. Sztyber (Toruń 2005), 168–169, 172, 183 ff., and passim.

called “Calvinist” also in the title.[75] This characteristic appeared later occasionally in the conflict with George Rákóczi II, but more frequently in the 1680s in connection with Thököly. Still, even in the debate at the beginning of the Thirty Years’ War, it was not the only attitude towards Hungarians, as indicated by the title of another popular print: *Seventy reasons, for which Poland should not help Austria against Hungarians and Bohemians* (1619).[76] It argued by way of political and moral reasons, but—significantly—not via a common past or long-lasting friendship, ideas which were present in diplomatic texts in the previous decades and occasionally still in the mid-seventeenth century.[77]

No doubt, the periods of political antagonism—together with the changing confessional image of both Poland-Lithuania and attempts of Calvinist confessionalisation in Transylvania under Bethlen and the Rákóczis—strengthened the tendency to perceive the land and its people through the viewpoint of religion. It was also influenced by the negative opinions towards Hungarians present in Habsburg propaganda and other newspapers from German-speaking territories. The confessional perspective did not, however, reach the same extent as in the images of Swedes, Muscovites or Germans, but rather remained subsidiary in the representations of Hungarians.[78]

A comparative perspective

The connection between the confessional and political issues in the early modern Polish image of Hungarians seemed to result also from the durable political dependence of large part of Hungary and Transylvania on the Ottoman Empire. This image was therefore partly influenced by the image

[75] K. Zawadzki, *Prasa ulotna za Zygmunta III* [Press during the rule of Sigismund III] (Warsaw 1997), 124, 126: *Nowe Nowiny z Czech, Tatar y z Węgier…*; *Pieśń o cnych Lysowskich Kozakach abo Pogrom Czechów y Kalwinistów przez Lisowczyki…*

[76] Biblioteka Czartoryskich, Kraków (Czartoryski Library, Cracow), Ms 1362 II, microfilm: BN Mf. 21638; on the text cf. H. Gmiterek, “Polskie opinie o Czechach w dobie powstania 1618–1620” [Polish opinions on Bohemians in the time of the 1618–1620 uprising], in *Polaków i Czechów wizerunek*, 187–188 (quotes older studies).

[77] Cf. Hopp, *Az “antemurale.”* For the opinion in Poland-Lithuania on the events of the Thirty Years’ War, see R. Lolo, *Rzeczpospolita wobec wojny trzydziestoletniej (1618-1635). Opinie i stanowiska szlachty* [The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth attitude towards the Thirty Years’ War (1618–1635). Opinions and attitudes of the nobility] (Pułtusk 2004).

[78] Niewiara, “Inni,” 180–183.

of "pagans": Ottomans, Tartars and the Muslim world—mostly considered as one of the major threats—and of Christian tributaries of the sultan. Still, it was not simply a confessional issue, but included a whole set of stereotypes: cultural, historical and political. Some analogies between the image of Hungarians and those of the inhabitants of some other countries can be observed.

I mentioned the similarities in the Polish opinion towards Hungarians and Czechs. In the sixteenth century, a positive attitude towards Czechs prevailed and, as indicated above, they were also supported by Polish opinion against Habsburg rule. Yet, just like in the case of the Hungarians, their situation began to be taken into account mainly in the context of the Habsburg monarchy and was strongly influenced by attitudes towards the dynasty. Furthermore, the image of the Czechs was ambiguous: it involved a plea of "heresy," which originated from the European impact of Hussitism. Similar to the Hungarians, Czechs were characterized as "rebels," this plea depending strongly on the political orientation of the authors. Generally, in Polish opinion of the seventeenth century, Czechs were treated with greater distance and after 1620 also with less interest compared to the mighty neighbours. Contrary to the image of Hungarians, which changed over time, negative attitudes towards Czechs at that time determined also stereotype-building in the eighteenth and nineteenth century.[79] One might add, though, that Italians were blamed for a similar set of faults, including treachery and disunity.[80]

Some similarities can be found also in comparison with the early modern Polish representations of Vlachs and Moldavians. It was the political subjection to the Ottomans which was reflected in images of the inhabitants of those principalities as well as Transylvania. Although Transylvanians were commonly characterized as Hungarians, the peculiar status of the principality could be used as an argument. During the reign of Stephen Báthory, for example, it was evoked by the anti-royal opposition of the 1580s. In texts like the speech of Krzysztof Zborowski at the 1585 Diet or Bartosz Paprocki's pamphlets, the Transylvanians were intentionally associated with the inhabitants of other Ottoman tributaries, Serbia, the Ottoman Empire and even Muscovy, in order to slander the ruler because of his origin and alleged preference for tyranny. In the early seventeenth century, the name "Vlachs" appeared in critical statements about Hungarians who were supported in Poland during the rule of Stephen Báthory. Also at the time of Rákóczi's invasion, the Transylvanians were addressed as

[79] *Polaków i Czechów wizerunek* (see papers by W. Iwańczak and H. Gmiterek).
[80] Tygielski, *Włosi*, 218.

"Vlachs."[81] Wallachia and Moldavia were associated with political instability and depicted as dangerous areas on a lesser civilizational level, their inhabitants seen often as soldiers with the inclination to pillage.[82] The geographical proximity and dependency on the Ottomans made it possible to extend the features attributed to them onto Transylvanians and even Hungarians. It was, however, mainly for rhetorical purposes and as a part of an argument, and does not testify to a lack of knowledge about the southern neighbours.

Stephen Báthory and the stereotype of Hungarians

As indicated, the qualities of the Transylvanian princes often played a crucial role in shaping popular opinion on their country and the Hungarians. The negative characteristics that spread in seventeenth-century Poland-Lithuania, mainly in connection with Gabriel Bethlen, George Rákóczi II and Emmerich Thököly, were balanced by positive remarks. These appeared by recalling the reign of King Stephen Báthory, where opinions on his rule commonly merged with views about his compatriots. At first, the king's successes in his wars against Muscovy hindered criticism. Also, skilful royal propaganda influenced the favourable image of the ruler. However, in the last years of the king's reign, this opinion was disturbed by the controversy around his role in the execution of Samuel Zborowski (1584), a member of an influential family who were antagonists of Báthory, but above all Chancellor Jan Zamoyski.[83] The harsh criticism was

---

81 *Diariusze sejmowe r. 1585*, 372–373; B. Paprocki, "Upominek albo przestroga zacnemu Narodowi Polskiemu" [A reminder or warning for the noble Polish nation], in *Bartosza Paprockiego dwie broszury polityczne z lat 1587 i 1588*, ed. by J. Czubek (Cracow 1900), 25, 35–36; *Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu*, 2:436; cf. Brzeziński, "Tyran," 340–342 and fn. 60.

82 Porawska, "Stereotypy," 171, 177–178; Niewiara, *Wyobrażenia*, 213–214. For sources, parallels and the contemporary intellectual discourse of "othering" the Vlachs, see G. Almási, "Constructing the Wallach 'Other' in the Late Renaissance," in *Whose Love of Which Country*, 91–129.

83 On internal politics during Báthory's reign: E. Dubas-Urwanowicz, *O nowy kształt Rzeczypospolitej. Kryzys polityczny w państwie w latach 1576–1586* [For a new shape of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The political crisis in the years 1576–1586] (Warsaw 2013); on the royal propaganda: I. Horn, *Báthory István uralkodói portréja* [The image of Stephen Báthory as a ruler], in *Portré és imázs. Politikai propaganda és reprezentáció a kora újkorban*, ed. by N. G. Etényi and I. Horn (Budapest 2008), 363–400; K. Zawadzki, *Początki prasy polskiej. Gazety ulotne i seryjne XVI-XVIII wieku* [The beginnings of the Polish press. Occasional and serial newspapers of the 16th and 17th century] (Warsaw 2002), 69–88.

an effect of the internal political struggle, but involved also remarks concerning Hungarians. The opposition demanded that Hungarians be deprived of the dignities and wealth they gained during Báthory's rule. The antagonism that arose around Hungarians surrounding the king was real, but undoubtedly in that time it was used as an instrument in internal conflict. Numerous authors evidenced the negative feelings about the king and his policy, as well as Hungarian noblemen (perceived as rivals for various posts), courtiers and soldiers. Either way, such a reaction to foreigners surrounding the ruler was rather typical for the Polish-Lithuanian controversies around elected kings, and dated back to classical patterns (Aristotle's *Politics*).[84]

Criticism towards Báthory and his countrymen did not cease after his death in 1586, as some polemical writings and debates of the *interregnum* clearly indicate.[85] This debate continued until the early seventeenth century—one can find critical remarks on Báthory in political journalism of the rebellion of 1606–1609—but at the same time a positive narrative emerged.[86] Gradually it prevailed and consequently replaced the earlier debates; in the mid-seventeenth century only minor remarks recalled the negative aspects of Báthory's reign.[87] This shift was caused partly through the influence of historiography, and partly by the growing need to recollect a victorious ruler in the period of wars with Muscovy (1609–1618, 1632–1634 and 1654–1667). Interesting evidence of this process is the "catalogues of the rulers" *(icones*, *imagines*): compact, partly rhymed and frequently illustrated prints, which spread and preserved the popular view of the state's history.[88] The texts were based on major historiographical

---

84 *Diariusze sejmowe r. 1585*, 290, 354; Tazbir, "Początki," 377–380 (id., "Ksenofobia," 250–253); Brzeziński, "Tyran," 343–344.

85 BN Ms II.6607, 2–9 (a dialogue between a foreigner and a Pole on the evaluation of Báthory); *Diariusze sejmowe R. 1587. Sejmy konwokacyjny i elekcyjny* [Records of the 1587 Diets. The convocation and election diet], ed. by A. Sokołowski (Scriptores Rerum Polonicarum, 11) (Cracow 1887), 29–33, 75, 103, 230.

86 *Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu*, 2:69, 428, 435–436, 460; 3:273–274, 280 (see criticism on the king and ennoblement of Hungarians).

87 Cf. A. Obodziński, *Pandora starożytna monarchów polskich…* [The ancient Pandora of the Polish monarchs…] (Cracow 1640, 1643), 191 (the "unfortunate" solution of the Zborowski affair, the king died without confession).

88 On the genre in Polish Renaissance and Baroque literature: J. Malicki, "Przemiany gatunkowe renesansowych *icones*" [The changes of the genre of the Renaissance *icones*], in *Legat wieku rycerskiego. Studia staropolskie dawne i nowe* (Katowice 2006), 114–129; M. Janik, "Wśród form popularyzacji historii w XVII wieku" [Among the forms of popularization of history in the 17th century], in

works, and the most popular pieces of the genre started with Clemens Janicius' *Vitae regum Polonorum* (1563) and then was continued by Jan Głuchowski's *Ikones książąt i królów polskich* (Icons of the Polish princes and kings, 1605).[89] Stephen Báthory appeared mainly as a successful warrior king and ruler of a mighty kingdom, who ruled justly and was loved by the serfs (e.g. Sebastian Fabian Klonowic and Jan Achacy Kmita). Short poems were limited only to the military achievements of the king, yet a more detailed image was derived from the Polish translation of Nicolaus Oláh's *Athila* (1574) and the chronicle of Marcin Bielski in its 1597 edition. Attila, in the translated text by Oláh, and Báthory, by Bielski, are both described as handsome and tall men, black-haired, with white teeth and hooked noses. This characteristic was re-used by other authors, so that it shaped the popular image of the king, but also to some extent reflected common representations of a Hungarian, at least of some male physical features. Some analogies from eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Polish diaries and literary fiction show that this portrait remained valid for much longer and could have influenced the perception of Hungarians.[90] A direct reference to Attila had a positive context there and it should not be regarded as an indication of Báthory's tyrannical or despotic nature.[91] The superb appearance of the king supplemented his moral and political virtues: justice, wisdom, bravery and a good command of languages (particularly Lat-

---

Staropolskie kompendia wiedzy, ed. by I. M. Dacka-Górzyńska and J. Partyka (Warsaw 2009), 203–224.

[89] C. Janicius, *Vitae regum Polonorum* (Antverpiae 1563); id., *Vitae regum Polonorum elegiaco carmine descriptae* (Cracoviae 1565); J. Głuchowski, *Ikones książąt i królów polskich. Reprodukcja fototypiczna wydania z 1605 r.* [*Icones* of the Polish princes and kings. A photographic reprint of the 1605 edition], ed. by B. Górska (Wrocław 1979) (repr. ed.).

[90] Niewiara, *Wyobrażenia*, 198 (Hungarians as handsome men); A. Sieroszewski, "The Hungarian Stereotype in the Polish Literature of the 19th and 20th centuries," in *Stereotypes and Nations*, 63 (brave, dark-haired, sharp-countenanced Hungarian).

[91] On the parallel between Stephen Báthory and Attila, see A. Zoltán, *Oláh Miklós Athila című munkájának XVI. századi lengyel és fehérorosz fordítása* [The 16th-century Polish and Belarussian translations of *Athila* by Nicolaus Oláh] (Nyíregyháza 2004), 18–19, 235–237; id., "Báthori és Attila" [Báthory and Attila] in *Cirill és Metód példáját követve... Tanulmányok H. Tóth Imre 70. születésnapjára*, ed. by K. Bibok et al. (Szeged 2002), 599–602; Petneki, *Węgry*, 78–83; cf. P. Ács, "Attila-kultusz a Báthory-korban" [The cult of Attila during the rule of the Báthorys], in *Neolatin irodalom Európában és Magyarországon*, ed. by L. Jankovits and G. Kecskeméti (Pécs 1996), 113–119.

in).[92] The influence of Báthory's heroic image was so predominant among authors of the seventeenth century, that it was shared also by those who judged Hungarians unfavourably and expressed ambiguity in their opinion of the king's reign.[93] On the other hand, the sentiment expressed towards the king did not abolish the critical opinion towards Hungarians. It formed a positive *cliché*, which corresponded to the actual needs of creating a shared view of the past.

Conclusion

My overview of the representations of Hungary and Hungarians in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Polish opinion may raise serious doubts regarding the common idea of affirmative Polish–Hungarian relations, almost undisturbed over the centuries. Still, my aim was rather to show how diverse this image could be and how it fitted into various narrative strategies, which depended on contemporary political goals, cultural patterns, formulaic conventions and prejudices. The view of a durable Polish–Hungarian friendship and alliance was based mainly on the rhetoric present in the texts of high politics, like diplomatic speeches or correspondence. No doubt, it affected popular opinion as well, and it should not be neglected, though a broader survey shows the complexity of opinions. They involved notions prevalent in European discourses on Hungary (such as the image of "rebellious" Hungarians or the image influenced by their "Hunnic" genealogy) and those of a specific role in local debates (such as moral admonition or the importance of the perspective of the noble estates). Many of the elements of the image remained valid and could be reused and actualized. Hungary had an important place in political debates, situated closely on the mental map. Hungarians were not classified as enemies, even in periods when hostile attitudes prevailed.[94] However, the country and its inhabitants started to be perceived as one of the "small" lands and as a part of the Habsburg domain (similarly to Bohemia and the Czechs). The attitude towards the dynasty evolved from the predominantly

---

[92] Cf. T. Zawacki, *Katalog książąt i królów polskich* [Catalogue of Polish princes and kings, 1st ed. 1609], ed. by J. Malicki (Katowice 2004); A. Guagninus, *Kronika Sarmacyey Europskiey* [Chronicle of the European Sarmatia] (Cracow 1611), 195–227; M. Goliński, *Zbiór królów i książąt polskich* [A collection of Polish kings and princes, 1649], Biblioteka Czartoryskich, Kraków, Ms 1320, 46v–48v.

[93] W. Potocki, "Katalog monarchów i królów polskich …" [Catalogue of the Polish monarchs and kings], in J. T. Trembecki, *Wirydarz poetycki*, ed. by A. Brückner, vol. 2 (Lwów 1911), 35–43; Petneki, "Wacław Potocki," 96–98.

[94] Cf. Niewiara, *Wyobrażenia*, 32–34, 41, 200–201.

anti-Habsburg rhetoric in the late sixteenth and in the early seventeenth century, to acceptance of the Habsburgs as the legal suzerain of the country in the second half of the seventeenth century. This perspective shaped the image of Hungarians. Negative opinions became more frequent in the late sixteenth century and did not disappear in the following decades. Nonetheless, this should not be accounted for by inferring a rise in a specific Polish type of xenophobia. The image of Hungarians was influenced to a large extent by the current events and widespread European opinions, with negative views centred on other attributes as well. In Poland-Lithuania, it resulted in an interesting combination of appraisal and disapproval, sympathy and contempt. That is why Hungary could appear as a rich and poor country at the same time, treated with both distance and compassion. Another example from the seventeenth-century account of Jakub Sobieski is indicative: though he did not spare his Hungarian hosts critical remarks and boasts, overall he had a great time, celebrating the feast and setting his irony aside with Hungarian wine.